

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Community Meeting Summary

January 12, 2006

Coyote Creek Golf Club

Community Members Present

Robert Andrews, Dianne Benson, Pete Benson, Dennis Brookins, Loren Burks, Dan Carroll, Joe Castro, Jenny Chan, Wai Fong Chan, Gary Chang, Esther Chen, Roger Costa, Sean Cottle, Tracy Cramer, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Richard DeSmet, Bob Eltgroth, Luis Freitas, Frank Giancola, Art Gonzales, Della Grifall, Robert Grifall, Evelyn Guess, Gerald Guess, R. Hanamoto, Janet Herbert, Paul Hebert, Xay Hoang, Jerry Hoefling, Ann Howard, Bob Howard, Anthony Intravia, Gloria Joe, William Joe, Mark Laisure, Ted Leung, Lee Lester, Linda Lee Lester, Steve LoBue, Vic LoBue, Hoang Minh, Troy Pham, Lil Ruscitto, Ken Saso, Annie Saso, Chou Mock, Mr. Mok, Siu Mok, Wing Mok, Arlene Perusina, Dan Perusina, Danford Perusina, Dick Norman, Daphne R., Peter Rothschild, Pauline Seebach, Kiram Shah, Kathy Sullivan, Wayland Tam, Frances Tollerico, Michael Tollerico, Al Victors, Margaret Vierro, Jesse Votaw, Kerry Williams, Ray Williams, David Wilson, Guo Y., Aki Yamashita, and Jitlai Yang.

Task Force Members Present

Co-chair Council member Forrest Williams and Ken Saso.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Mike Griffis (County Roads), Mark Frederick (SCCounty Parks), Jane Mark (SCCounty Parks), Bonnie Tognazzini (MHUSD), Shanna Boigon (SCCAOR), and Tim Steele (Sobrato Development Company).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present

Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), and Regina Mancera (PBCE).

Consultants

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers), Darin Smith (Economic and Planning Systems), and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting convened at 6:30 p.m. with Eileen Goodwin of Apex Strategies welcoming everyone to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) community meeting. Eileen introduced co-chair Council member Forrest Williams. Council member Williams welcomed everyone to the community meeting.

2. Agenda and Process Overview

Eileen reviewed the agenda. A show of hands indicated that there were about five first-time attendees and ten second-time attendees. A majority the attendees have attended most or all CVSP community meetings.

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) Department, provided an overview of the CVSP process. The City Council initiated the CVSP process in August 2002. The CVSP would be submitted to Council for consideration in 2007. Laurel reviewed the CVSP public outreach process, CVSP consultants, and Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes.

3. Plan Refinements and Project Description

Doug Dahlin of Dahlin Group and Ken Kay of KenKay Associates presented the plan refinements and project description.

Ken explained that the environmental footprint serves as a basis of the CVSP to create a community that is sensitive to its environment. The composite framework includes Fisher Creek, a focal lake, canal park, Parkway, in-valley transit, and Caltrain. Ken reviewed the policies and goals for CVSP blue infrastructure, green infrastructure, and non-vehicular circulation.

Doug reviewed street networks, school site locations, and the urban school concept. He explained the square footage potential for commercial, industrial/workplace, mixed-use office, and mixed-use commercial uses. There are 26,400 residential units provided for in the Plan.

Community members provided the following questions and comments:

- What is the projected total population? What is the projected median age? Would like information about population distribution to be available on the website. *There will be about 70,000 Coyote Valley residents. The median age is about 30 years old.*
- Concerned that the City is underestimating the K-12 student population. *The Morgan Hill Unified School District has verified the student generation rates. Coyote Valley is projected to have lower SGRs than Morgan Hill and Gilroy because higher density residential typologies typically attract people with fewer children.*
- How will traffic from South County and San Benito County be filtered through South Coyote Valley? *Highway 101 and Monterey Road will be the primary routes from areas south of Coyote Valley. Monterey Road will be widened to three lanes in each direction. There will be only two traffic signals on Monterey Road. The CVSP is currently not proposing the widening of Hale Avenue through the Greenbelt. Traffic impacts will be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Traffic mitigation identified in the EIR would become a part of the CVSP. The EIR will be available in fall 2006.*
- Are the two Monterey Road traffic signals only located in North and Mid-Coyote Valley? Will there be street improvements in the Greenbelt? *Yes, the two Monterey Road traffic signals are located north of Palm Avenue. The EIR will indicate what, if any, street improvements are necessary in the Greenbelt.*
- Concerned that there will not be any street improvements in South Coyote Valley. The Greenbelt is proposed as open space, but this is private property. Need a plan for the Greenbelt.
- Santa Teresa Boulevard and Hale Avenue are currently primary bicycle routes between San Jose and South County. *The CVSP will include many trails beyond the existing bicycle route on Santa Teresa Boulevard and Hale Avenue.*
- Existing transit routes are not shown. VTA route 68 is the second most used route in the County. How will transit routes be re-routed? How will this affect commute? *VTA route 68 can be modified.*
- It is Council's direction to plan for the extension of light rail transit. Where is the LRT extension into Coyote Valley shown? *The city has been meeting with VTA. Coyote Valley's bus rapid transit fixed guideway could be fitted with rails if VTA wants to extend LRT to Coyote Valley. The Caltrain station and the first segment of BRT will be established during the early phases of development to provide transit. Infrastructure will be phased in as jobs and housing are created. The City will continue to work with VTA, the County, and other agencies.*
- Has not heard any new information about the Greenbelt. The Greenbelt should be discussed at every meeting. The Greenbelt needs to be more flexible than any other part of the CVSP. Greenbelt property owners should not be ignored because they are also a part of the community. Need to plan for the Greenbelt. *There have been discussions about the Greenbelt Strategy and several Meetings with Greenbelt property owners, and there will continue to be discussion regarding the Greenbelt.*
- Concerned that if North and Mid-Coyote Valley is developed, recharged groundwater will not reach South Coyote Valley.

- Properties located east of Monterey Road were annexed into the City years ago with promises for urban development. The east side of Monterey Road should be included in the early phases of CVSP development.
- Some Urban Reserve property owners would like to increase their densities before the CVSP goes to Council for approval. The properties are located near Palm Avenue, Boulay Court, Caldwell Court, Lantz Drive, and Scheller Avenue. What is the process for changing densities in the Urban Reserve? *The CVSP may be able to accommodate the proposed density increase since it is consistent with Council's goals and objectives.*
- When will the Urban Reserve be annexed into the City? *The CVSP will be submitted for Council approval in 2007. Once Council approves the CVSP, the City will then apply to the Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission for annexation. The LAFCO process takes about one year.*

4. Approaches to Agricultural Mitigation

Darryl Boyd, with the PBCE Department, presented the proposed agricultural mitigation approach. The CVSP is addressing agricultural mitigation since it is required by the California Environmental Quality Act. The CVSP agricultural mitigation approach pertains to North and Mid-Coyote Valley agricultural conversion to urban development. Darryl explained the CEQA definition of "agricultural land." He reviewed the City's natural resources goals and policies per the San Jose 2020 General Plan, potential agricultural land conversion in San Jose, the California land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) model, and the City's agricultural land impact analysis process. The next step is to develop a mitigation program for converted agricultural land(s).

Community members provided the following questions and comments:

- Will there be agricultural mitigation for North, Mid, and South Coyote Valley? *There will be agricultural mitigation for urban development in North and Mid-Coyote Valley. The Greenbelt is a potential location for agricultural mitigation. It would be the responsibility of private property owners, however to purchase any land in the Greenbelt for mitigation.*
- Clarify mitigation. *The EIR will assess potential significant impacts from North and Mid-Coyote Valley urban development. CEQA requires that the EIR evaluate potential environmental impacts and identify mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a more acceptable level.*
- How will the City apply the LESA model? *City staff and consultants will all apply the LESA model to the CVSP, but one central group will perform the numerical calculations to determine the LESA score.*
- Greenbelt property owners feel like they are being left out. Should allow subdivision in South Coyote Valley. This would be an incentive for Greenbelt property owners to allow open space and agricultural preservation to take place in South Coyote Valley.
- Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning raised \$40-50,000 to create a clustered housing plan for the Greenbelt. Nothing can be done in the Greenbelt if it is privately owned property. North and Mid-Coyote Valley is "riding on the back" of South Coyote Valley for

agricultural mitigation. Is not against the CVSP, but it is a conflict of interest if North and Mid-Coyote Valley gets everything and South Coyote Valley gets nothing.

- In June 2001, Council agreed to spend \$3 million to acquire greenbelt property. Council later agreed to spend another \$1 million. Has the city bought any greenbelt property since then?
- Need to ask if farming is economically feasible. This was not mentioned in the presentation about approaches to agricultural mitigation.
- Is the Greenbelt only included in the specific plan to offset mitigation for loss of agricultural land in North and Mid-Coyote Valley? *Per Council's vision 1, 2, and 14, the specific plan includes South Coyote Valley for infrastructure financing only in order to achieve a permanent Greenbelt. South Coyote Valley's inclusion in the specific plan was not intended to re-evaluate or change land use regulations for the Greenbelt.*
- One of the San Jose 2020 General Plan goals is to avoid the premature conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses. Properties located east of Monterey Road can attest to this. These properties were annexed into the City since 1958 and have been paying for urban services they do not receive. The General Plan triggers have kept urban development away from annexed properties in Coyote Valley. When looking at agricultural mitigation approaches, need to take into account annexed properties and whether properties are actively farmed or irrigated.
- Confused about the Greenbelt Strategy's environmental challenges, economic opportunities and potential, environmental opportunities, and assumptions and principles. These seem like conflicting statements. *The Greenbelt Strategy and agricultural conversion are different issues. Sal Yakubu of the PBCE Department will help clarify any confusion.*
- Is the Greenbelt in the City's jurisdiction? If the City has no plans to move the Greenline south, does this mean that the changes people are asking for will not happen? *The Greenbelt is primarily under the county's jurisdiction. The City and County have similar regulations regarding minimum parcel sizes and subdivision. The City is not planning to change land use regulations. Voters approved the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary. The County has no plans to change any policies pertaining the Greenbelt area.*
- Highway 101 was widened, but there are still traffic problems southbound at Cochran Road during rush hour. Traffic conditions will worsen with 70,000 Coyote Valley residents. Why is the density so high? Finds it hard to believe that Coyote Valley will be a walking community. Concerned that there will not be any street improvements in South Coyote Valley. The CVSP is impacting South Coyote Valley and yet they will not receive any financial help. Property owners may also be able to get some money with agricultural mitigation. *Per Council's direction, Coyote Valley is envisioned as a high-density pedestrian and transit-oriented community with 25,000 residential units, at minimum. The City is committed to providing housing to a wide variety of income levels. The EIR will analyze potential impacts to areas south of Coyote Valley and determine whether any mitigation is necessary in the Greenbelt area.*

5. Other Updates

Laurel explained the next steps for agricultural mitigation outreach, the draft specific plan, fiscal impact analysis, financing strategy and other implementation elements, zoning, EIR, and community involvement.

Laurel indicated that the fourth Council progress report will take place on the afternoon of January 31, 2006. The agenda items include plan refinements, the EIR project description, and the agricultural mitigation approach. Public comments will be limited to two minutes.

Community members provided the following questions and comments:

- The fourth Council progress report has been rescheduled from January 24 to January 31? Yes.
- The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt was established in 1984. It was not created recently.
- The Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District raised \$250 million to acquire open space. Greenbelt financing should come from those who wanted the Greenbelt in 1984.
- Does not want South Coyote Valley to be referred to as the Greenbelt.
- Just because the Greenbelt was established by San Jose, Morgan Hill, and Santa Clara County does not mean that it is right and cannot be flexible. The CVSP has been flexible for jobs and housing requirements. The Greenline can be changed to meet new requirements.
- Greenbelt properties are under county jurisdiction. The City is imposing on Greenbelt property owners. The county also feels forced into the Greenbelt concept.

6. Next Steps/Adjourn

Eileen thanked everyone for participating in the community meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.